

# Language use, language attitudes and identity on Bonaire

**Ellen-Petra Kester**

Utrecht University

P.M.Kester@uu.nl

**Samantha Buijink**

Utrecht University

samantha.buijink@gmail.com

## Abstract

In this article we report on a survey that was conducted on Bonaire, one of the six Caribbean islands that were formerly known as the Netherlands Antilles. The majority of the Bonairean population speaks Papiamentu, a Spanish/Portuguese lexifier creole, as their mother tongue. Dutch used to be the only officially recognized language on the island up until 2007, when the Netherlands Antilles recognized Papiamentu and English as co-official languages besides Dutch.

Since the dissolution of the Netherlands Antilles on October 10 of 2010, Bonaire has adopted a new political status as an exceptional municipality of the European Netherlands. This political reform has a strong impact on the small island community due to demographic growth, the influence of European Dutch legislation and the increasing cost of living (Bak-Piard 2010). The status of Papiamentu has changed dramatically as it is no longer recognized as an official language, its use as a home language is in decline and its role in the education system is under attack (Bak-Piard 2016).

This article presents the results of 262 questionnaires that were distributed on Bonaire to investigate patterns of language use, language attitudes and identity among the Bonairean population. The results pointed out that the speech community of Bonaire is rather homogeneous. Papiamentu is widely used and attitudes toward Papiamentu and Bonairean identity are overall (very) positive. These findings provide insights that are important for the development of a sustainable language policy in the education system, serving Bonairean students to achieve their full potential.

**Keywords:** Bonaire, Dutch Caribbean, Papiamentu, language attitudes, multilingualism

## 1. Introduction <sup>1</sup>

In this article, we present the results of a survey that was conducted in 2014 on Bonaire. Bonaire forms, together with Aruba and Curaçao, the Dutch Leeward islands (or ABC-islands) that are situated some 20 to 80 km north of the coast of Venezuela. The islands have been part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands almost uninterruptedly since 1634,

---

<sup>1</sup> We thank Professor Dr. R. Severing, Dr. E. Echteld and Drs. A. Jessurun for inviting the first author as a guest lecturer at the University of Curaçao in April 2014. We also express our gratitude to the students of the Master's program of Education, who distributed the questionnaire among their students, relatives and friends and wrote excellent course papers about the results. We gratefully mention Sanne Roelfsema and Jodie Townsend at Utrecht University, who entered the results of the original questionnaires into an electronic database. Finally, we thank the reviewers for their useful suggestions to clarify and elaborate certain aspects of this article. We are fully accountable for any errors or misinterpretations of the data.

when the Dutch took possession of Curaçao.<sup>2</sup> The majority of the populations of these islands speaks Papiamentu, a Spanish/Portuguese lexifier creole, as their mother tongue.<sup>3</sup> The origin of Papiamentu has been a topic of extensive scholarly debate that focuses on the role of the two main lexifiers (Spanish and Portuguese). Two central hypotheses can be distinguished in the literature. First, Papiamentu developed from an Afro-Portuguese creole that was used along the African coast and transferred to Curaçao during the slave trade in the second half of the 17th century. Subsequently, extensive contact with Spanish in the Caribbean region led to relexification of the Portuguese lexicon. The second hypothesis departs from a Spanish-based creole that was formed on Curaçao prior to the arrival of the Dutch in 1634, assuming that Portuguese vocabulary was introduced by the Sephardic Jews over the course of the 17th century. Recent studies, such as Jacobs (2012), advocate for the first hypothesis, pointing out strong linguistic similarities between Papiamentu and the Portuguese lexifier creoles spoken in Upper Guinea and providing ample evidence for historical ties between this region and Curaçao in the second half of the 17th century. Papiamentu apparently stabilized by around 1700 and spread from Curaçao to Bonaire and later to Aruba (Holm 2000: 78).

For centuries, Dutch was the only officially recognized language on the six islands of the Netherlands Antilles, dominating the administrative and educational systems, as well as other formal domains of the public sphere. Global languages such as English and Spanish play an important role as well, due to migration, tourism, and the increasing influence of the media (television, the internet).

Since the dissolution of the Netherlands Antilles on October 10 of 2010, Bonaire has adopted a new political status as an exceptional municipality of the European Netherlands. This political reform has a strong impact on the small island community due to the influx of immigrants from the European Netherlands and the influence of European Dutch legislation. According to Bak-Piard (2010, 2016) the political reforms also have severe consequences for the use and vitality of Papiamentu, fueling long-standing debates about the role of the language in the education system.

## 2. Language ideologies in the Dutch Caribbean

For centuries, the language situation on the ABC-islands was characterized by diglossia (Ferguson 1959), because Dutch was the only officially recognized language used for ‘higher functions’ in formal domains, whereas the use of Papiamentu was limited to ‘lower functions’ of daily communication in informal domains. The functional difference between the two languages entailed a certain contrast in prestige, but Papiamentu has been the language of general use since the 17th century, serving as a *lingua franca*

---

<sup>2</sup> The other islands that belong to the Kingdom of the Netherlands are the Dutch Windward islands, St. Maarten, St. Eustatius and Saba, which are situated in the Northern part of the Caribbean, close to Puerto Rico. Up until October 2010 five islands were known as the Netherlands Antilles. After the dissolution of the Netherlands Antilles Curaçao and St. Maarten became autonomous countries within the Kingdom of the Netherlands, whereas Bonaire, St. Eustatius and Saba became exceptional municipalities under European Dutch rule. Aruba has been an autonomous country within the Kingdom since 1986.

<sup>3</sup> The variety of the language spoken on Bonaire and Curaçao is known as Papiamentu, whereas the Aruban variety is referred to as Papiamentu. The varieties are mutually intelligible, but they make use of different spelling conventions.

between the three main groups of inhabitants: the Dutch, Sephardic Jews and African slaves (Carroll 2015: 119). Papiamentu became a strong identity marker that differentiated locals from outsiders, surviving close contact with Dutch, English and Spanish (Carroll 2015: 120). This situation explains why the language has a high social prestige in comparison to other creole languages and is widely used by speakers of all social strata. (Winford 1985, 1994).

The diglossic situation changed since the beginning of this century when Papiamentu was recognized as a co-official language with Dutch in Aruba (2003) and with Dutch and English in the Netherlands Antilles (2007) leading to increasing use in the administrative and education systems as well as in the media.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, the education system and language policy on the islands are still Euro-centric and tend to be dominated by European discourses that assume monolingualism to be the norm.

Knowledge of Dutch is considered important for tertiary studies (on the ABC-islands and in the European Netherlands) and for the local job market (government employment in particular). Consequently, many speakers are ambivalent or negative about the use of Papiamentu in the education system and strongly prefer students to be submerged in a system that uses Dutch as the only language of instruction (Dijkhoff & Pereira 2010: 240, 244). The use of Dutch as a language of instruction, however, is problematic for Caribbean students, because for most of them Dutch is a foreign language they do not encounter outside the classroom. Consequently, the use of Dutch as the language of instruction excludes the great majority of the students from access to formal education and social mobility (Mijts, Kester & Faraclas 2020).

The language policy in the education system has been an issue of long-standing political and societal debates that have become more urgent on Bonaire since the island has become a municipality under European Dutch rule.<sup>5</sup> This situation calls for an in-depth study of language use as well as attitudes toward language and identity across the Bonairean population.<sup>6</sup>

For this purpose, we developed a questionnaire inspired by previous surveys (Garrett 2008; Kester 2011, 2020) that were conducted on the neighboring island of Curaçao and based on the theoretical framework of Baker (1992). Baker (1992: 11) follows Ajzen (1988: 4) in his definition of an attitude as “a disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to an object, person, institution, or event”. The research reported on in this article is concerned with dispositions to respond favorably or unfavorably to (the use of) certain languages in the context of Bonaire. Following Garrett (2008) we measure attitudes toward Papiamentu by evaluating the opinions of our participants about the importance of Papiamentu in carrying out certain activities. Baker (1992: 31) observes

---

<sup>4</sup> In Curaçao and Bonaire Papiamentu is the language of instruction during the first four years of primary education (Severing & Weijer 2008: 251). In Aruba Papiamentu is used as a language of instruction in Kindergarten and in special needs education. On the three islands the language is taught as a compulsory subject in secondary education (Dijkhoff & Pereira 2010).

<sup>5</sup> See Faraclas, Kester & Mijts (2019) for a case study about the language policy in the education system of St. Eustatius (another municipality under European Dutch rule) that led to a change in the language of instruction (from Dutch to English) on the island.

<sup>6</sup> We refer the reader to Kester & Timp (2018) for a seminal study of language attitudes on Bonaire by means of an experiment based on the matched-guise technique and a short questionnaire. For reasons of space the findings of this study are not included in this article.

that language attitudes are related to instrumental and integrative orientation, a distinction that is also made in research on motivation in second language acquisition (Gardner & Lambert 1972). An instrumental orientation reflects pragmatic, utilitarian motives and is related to the need for achievement, whereas integrative orientation reflects social and interpersonal relationships and the need for affiliation (Baker 1992: 31).

Edwards (2009: 162) provides a definition of ethnic identity in terms of group membership: “Ethnic identity is allegiance to a group – large or small, socially dominant or subordinate – with which one has ancestral links. There is no necessity for a continuation, over generations, of the same socialisation or cultural patterns, but some sense of a group boundary must persist. This can be sustained by shared objective characteristics (language, religion, etc.), or by more subjective contributions to a sense of ‘groupness’, or by some combination of both. Symbolic or subjective attachments must relate, at however distant a remove, to an observably real past.”

The populations of the ABC-islands share multiple identities, as they are members of Caribbean insular communities with diverse ancestral links: to the Arowak inhabitants of the islands prior to the occupation by the Spaniards (1499) and the Dutch (1634), as well to people from African descent who arrived during the slave trade. They are ethnically distinct from the European Dutch population (due to different ancestral ties), but share Dutch citizenship, as the islands are part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The questionnaire of our survey is an attempt to investigate this dual Caribbean/Dutch identity, following Garrett’s (2008) notion of identity that was based on Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) Social Identity Theory. In this framework social identity was defined on an individual level rather than by group membership: “... individuals must first internalize their group membership as an aspect of their self-concept” (Garrett 2008: 28). The self-concept can be observed (and measured) as a function of the strength of one’s identity in a certain situation (Garrett 2008: 28), as illustrated by the questions of our survey.

### **3. The language situation on Bonaire**

Two articles by Bak-Piard (2010, 2016) address the language situation on Bonaire and specifically the use and vitality of Papiamentu since the political reforms of October 2010. In her first article, Bak-Piard (2010: 43) observes that the new political status of the island and demographic growth cause controversy and threaten to split the community into the ‘original’ population and the newly arrived residents from the European part of the Kingdom, evoking sentiments of ‘re-colonization of the island by the Dutch’ and ‘dominance from the side of the Dutch’.<sup>7</sup> These sentiments also contribute to the concern that Papiamentu will be subjected to greater pressure and might eventually even disappear on Bonaire, due to the influx of European Dutch citizens and the integration of the island into the European Netherlands (Bak-Piard 2010: 43). However, Bak-Piard also expresses optimism, observing that Papiamentu is a powerful language that has survived close contact with Dutch, English and Spanish over the course of several centuries.

---

<sup>7</sup> The population of the island expanded from 15.679 to 19.408 inhabitants between 2011 and 2016 (Central Bureau of Statistics, Caribisch Nederland).

In her second article, Bak-Piard (2016) expresses greater concern about the position and vitality of Papiamentu, after 6 years of European Dutch rule. Papiamentu is no longer recognized as an official language on Bonaire, as the language law and legislation agreement for the BES-islands (Taalregelingen voor de BES-eilanden, 2012) states that it is only “...to be used- to some extent- in education, government and the courts [...]” (Bak-Piard 2016: 99).<sup>8,9</sup> This change in language policy has a strong impact in the education system as there has been pressure to increase proficiency in the Dutch language. According to the educational professionals the current school system aims at “teaching to the (Dutch) test”, suppressing the time and attention formerly dedicated to Papiamentu in the classroom (Bak-Piard 2016: 101). The new language policy also seems to have induced negative language attitudes among the younger generations. Students have developed negative attitudes towards Dutch, because of the behavior of European Dutch language professionals who impose their will and make the students feel ‘inferior’ (Bak-Piard 2016: 102). Students have developed negative attitudes towards Papiamentu as well, because educational professionals and parents -especially those from the European Netherlands- think that Papiamentu is irrelevant for academic or professional achievements (Bak-Piard 2016: 108)

Bak-Piard (2016) also observes some shifts in home languages among the Bonairean population, as the use of Papiamentu is decreasing and the use of Dutch and Spanish is expanding, as illustrated in Table 1. Although these changes do not necessarily imply endangerment of Papiamentu (90% of the families are multilingual, Bak-Piard 2016: 103), intergenerational transmission of the language may be impeded by the new policy that promotes the use of Dutch and enhances negative attitudes towards Papiamentu.

Table 1. *Home languages spoken on Bonaire in percentages (Bak-Piard, 2016: 103)<sup>10</sup>.*

Most frequently used at home	1992	2001	2013
Papiamentu	78.2	72.3	68.3
Dutch	7.1	10.4	15.4
English	3.7	4.0	4.5
Spanish	10.3	11.4	15.2
Remainder	0.7	1.8	1.2

Although Bak-Piard observes that Papiamentu still meets several of the criteria for continued vitality formulated by UNESCO (2011) she concludes that the vitality of the language is endangered on Bonaire, as it is no longer recognized as an official language,

<sup>8</sup> Since the political reforms of October 2010, the islands that are exceptional municipalities of the European Netherlands are abbreviated as the BES-islands: Bonaire, (Sint) Eustatius and Sint Maarten.

<sup>9</sup> Recently (March 2021), the European Dutch government and the public entity of Bonaire published an administrative agreement to acknowledge Papiamentu as a fully fledged and autonomous language on Bonaire (besides Dutch, Spanish and English) with the objective of protecting, encouraging and safeguarding its use under current laws and legislations (Bestuursafpraak voor het Papiaments op Bonaire 2021). There is no mention of the status of Papiamentu and English as co-official languages besides Dutch on Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Sint Maarten (Rijksoverheid, 2021), which will further increase the confusion about the status of the different languages and the corresponding language policies on the islands.

its use as a home language is in decline and its role in the education system is under attack as well (Bak-Piard 2016: 108). The current position of Papiamentu on Bonaire is clearly different from its traditional role as a *lingua franca* that used to be acquired by waves of immigrants for centuries, as we pointed out above. The situation rather illustrates what Edwards (2009: 237) describes as: “... language endangerment is best understood as a *symptom* of bigger things, [...]”: the political reforms of 2010 have destabilized the position of the major home language in the small island community.

#### 4. Research questions and hypotheses

In this article we discuss the results of a survey about language use, language attitudes and identity on the island of Bonaire, addressing the following research questions:

- (1) How can we characterize the use of Papiamentu, Dutch, English, Spanish and other languages in different domains (inside the family, outside the family, with strangers)?
- (2) What are the attitudes toward Papiamentu, measured by the importance of the language in carrying out certain activities?
- (3) What are the attitudes toward the dual identity of the Bonairean population, as members of a Caribbean insular community and as Dutch citizens?
- (4) Are there any differences between groups of participants with diverse characteristics concerning their age group, education level and family backgrounds?

The following tentative hypotheses were formulated with respect to the use and attitudes toward Papiamentu and Dutch, as well as toward the European Netherlands and Dutch citizenship:

- 1) There is increasing use of Dutch and decreasing use of Papiamentu (especially in formal domains), because the use of Dutch is promoted by the current language policy.
- 2) There are negative tendencies in the attitudes toward Papiamentu. The language may be regarded as unimportant in carrying out activities that are related to formal domains and instrumental orientation (job market, education system).
- 3) There are negative tendencies in the attitudes toward Dutch citizenship and the European Netherlands, resulting from the political reforms and their consequences for the community.
- 4) Scores that indicate decreasing use of Papiamentu and negative attitudes toward Papiamentu, Dutch identity and Dutch citizenship are significantly higher among younger participants compared to those of older participants.

## 5. Methodology

### 5.1. Participants

The questionnaire was filled out by 262 participants. The participants belonged to three different age groups and they were categorized by education level as well as by (parental) birthplace. The age groups are presented in Table 2, with Means, Standard Deviations and corresponding numbers of participants.<sup>11,12</sup>

Table 2. *Number of participants belonging to different categories of age groups (including Means, Standard Deviations) education levels and origin (and totals).*

<b>Age</b>			
	<i>n</i>	Mean	SD
G1 (older)	37	62	6
G2	42	48	4
G3 (younger)	183	17	2
total	262		
<b>Education level</b>			
lower	148		
higher	98		
total	246		
<b>Origin</b>			
local	171		
migrant	84		
total	255		

We classified the participants in two different categories in accordance with their education level. The education system on Bonaire, as on the other islands of the former Netherlands Antilles, is based on the system of the European Netherlands. We classified university education (WO) and pre-university education (VWO), higher vocational

<sup>11</sup> Twenty-three participants were not included in Table 2, because the birthplace of their parents (7 cases) or their education level (16 cases) were unknown.

<sup>12</sup> The specific ranges of the years of birth and the ages of the three generations are illustrated in the table below.

	min. birth year	max. birth year	min. age	max. age
G1 (older)	1933	1958	56	81
G2	1959	1977	37	55
G3 (younger)	1992	2001	13	22

education (HBO) and higher preparatory education (HAVO) as ‘higher’ education levels and all other levels as ‘lower’ education levels.<sup>13</sup>

We distinguished two categories of ‘local’ and ‘migrant’ participants depending on their (parental) birthplace. There were 171 ‘local’ participants, characterized by the following criteria:

- 1) The participant was born on Bonaire, as well as at least one of his/her parents;
- 2) The participant was not born on Bonaire, but both of his/her parents were.<sup>14</sup>

The 84 participants who did not meet these criteria were categorized as ‘migrants’.<sup>15</sup>

## 5.2. Materials

The questionnaire contained statements and questions about four different issues: (i) the Bonairean and Dutch identity of the participants; (ii) the importance of Papiamentu in carrying out certain activities; (iii) the use and proportion of use of Papiamentu, English, Spanish, Dutch and other languages in different domains and with different interlocutors; (iv) questions about demographic characteristics of the participants, such as age, sex, (parental) birthplace and education level.<sup>16</sup>

## 5.3. Procedure

The questionnaire (in Appendix A) was distributed in 2014 by Aruban, Bonairean and Curaçaoan students who were enrolled in the Master’s program of Education at the University of Curaçao. The survey was part of a course about multilingualism and language acquisition taught by the first author of this article. As most of the students work as language teachers in secondary education, they distributed the questionnaires among their own students in the classroom as well as among friends, colleagues and family members of older age groups. In this article, we will only present and analyze the results of participants on Bonaire. Data from the paper copies of the questionnaires were entered into an electronic database.

## 5.4. Statistical analysis

The data was analysed with SPSS. We found that almost half of the participants had one or more missing values, mainly because they answered the questions about proportional language use with specific interlocutors (part 3 of the questionnaire) by means of X’s

---

<sup>13</sup> In the European Dutch system, VMBO prepares students for secondary vocational education (MBO), HAVO provides access to higher professional education offered by universities of applied sciences (HBO), VWO prepares students for research universities (WO).

<sup>14</sup> In the majority of cases, the participant as well as both parents were born on Bonaire (82). The number of participants who were born on Bonaire as well as their mother (39) or as well as their father (25) were quite similar. In 24 cases the participant was not born on Bonaire, but both parents were. We included these participants in the category of ‘local’ participants, because many Bonaireans were born in the hospital of the neighboring island of Curaçao.

<sup>15</sup> In 34 cases the participant, neither his/her parents were born on Bonaire. 12 participants were born on Bonaire but both parents were foreign born. 49 participants who were born elsewhere had a mother (25) or father (13) who were born on Bonaire.

<sup>16</sup> The questionnaire only addressed whether the participant and his/her parents were born on Bonaire or elsewhere, avoiding the specification of their birthplaces to ensure the anonymity of the participants.

instead of the intended numbers 1–5. Due to this large number of participants with only a few missing values, we decided to do a pairwise elimination of these participants from the corresponding parts of the questionnaire. This reduction implies that the  $n$  varies across the analyses performed on the respective parts of the questionnaire that will be presented in the following sections.

A principal component analysis (PCA), with Varimax rotation abstracting factors with Eigen value higher than 1, was conducted on the parts of the questionnaire addressing the importance of Papiamentu and the attitudes towards the Dutch and Bonairean identity, but not on the part addressing language use (see below). The PCA on the one hand is a confirmation of the thematic parts of the questionnaire and on the other hand a way to perform further statistical analysis on the data.

We executed a reliability test (the Cronbach's Alpha) for each cluster of items in a component. In addition to the factor scores the average scores of the clusters of items were computed. The *factor* scores were then analysed for statistical differences by a GLM univariate ANOVA (A.K.A. three-way independent ANOVA or independent factorial ANOVA). The factor scores were analysed by comparing groups of different ages, education levels and origins (specified by (parental) birthplace). When comparing more than two groups, a Bonferroni post-hoc test was performed. Overall, we accepted communalities above .450. Variance explained per factor was set above 10% and together above 60%, with a Reliability above .550 (Cronbach's alpha).

The part addressing language use was analysed by grouping speech partners together and computing an average score in these domains per language. The score was then compared by a multivariate ANOVA with groups of different ages, education levels and origins as fixed factors. Single items (like the speech partner 'strangers'), which correspond to nominal data, were analysed performing a Kruskal-Wallis test. When comparing more than two groups, the Mann-Whitney test served as a post-hoc test. Subsequently, a Bonferroni correction was applied to ensure that all reported effects corresponded to a .0167 level of significance.

The effect size is expressed in partial eta squared ( $\eta_p^2$ ). The larger the effect size the stronger the relationship between the two variables. Using the rules of thumb, we consider  $\eta_p^2=0.01$  a 'small' effect size, 0.06 a 'medium' effect size and 0.14 a 'large' effect size.

## 6. Results

In this section we will present the results of the different parts of the questionnaire regarding language use (6.1), language attitudes (6.2) and the Bonairean/Dutch identity (6.3) of the participants. Within the individual sections, the results of the statistical analysis will be presented in accordance with the demographic characteristics of the participants regarding their age group, education level and origin (defined by (parental) birthplace).

## 6.1. Language use

In this section we will present the results of our survey regarding the use of Papiamentu, Dutch, English, Spanish and other languages in different domains.<sup>17</sup> The domain ‘within the family’ corresponds to the categories mother, father, brother and sister and the domain ‘outside the family’ includes the categories friends, fellow students, teacher, colleagues and boss. The third domain comprises language use in contact with strangers. The structure of the section is defined by the demographic characteristics of the participants: age group (6.1.1), education level (6.1.2) and origin (6.1.3).

### 6.1.1. Age groups

Table 3 presents the average scores for the use of Papiamentu, Dutch, English, Spanish and other languages in different domains by different age groups.

Table 3. *Average scores for language use in different domains by participants of different age groups, including Means and Standard Deviations (0=no use, 5=frequent use).*

		Age groups					
		G1 (n=14)		G2 (n=17)		G3 (n=70)	
Within the family		mean	sd	mean	sd	mean	sd
1	Papiamentu	5,00	0,00	4,54	1,22	4,36	1,31
2	Dutch	0,47	1,17	0,24	0,80	0,59	1,11
3	English	0,35	0,85	0,21	0,60	0,78	1,32
4	Spanish	0,29	0,69	0,22	0,57	0,64	1,16
5	Other language	0,13	0,38	0,07	0,27	0,24	0,60
Outside the family		(n=24)		(n=29)		(n=121)	
1	Papiamentu	4,13	1,40	3,67	1,49	3,96	1,18
2	Dutch	1,69	1,77	1,84	1,59	1,63	1,44
3	English	0,42	0,61	0,44	0,83	1,19	1,52
4	Spanish	0,33	0,61	0,19	0,45	0,62	1,00
5	Other language	0,03	0,18	0,13	0,52	0,26	0,67
Strangers		(n=33-34)		(n=36-40)		(n=135-165)	
1	Papiamentu	2,85	2,29	3,39	2,18	3,39	1,93
2	Dutch	1,85	2,08	1,71	1,92	1,65	1,89
3	English	0,97	1,36	1,05	1,55	1,77	1,97
4	Spanish	0,76	1,35	0,63	1,10	1,00	1,50
5	Other language	0,71	1,62	0,42	1,29	0,55	1,23

The results in Table 3 point out that Papiamentu was the most frequently used language in all different domains by the three age groups. A statistical analysis of the data provided

<sup>17</sup> Bak-Piard (2010: 40) mentions Chinese, Hindi, Sranantongo and Portuguese as language backgrounds of Bonairean students in addition to Papiamentu, Dutch, English and Spanish.

the following results concerning the use of the respective languages in the different domains.

#### Language use within the family

The age groups were homogenous with respect to language use at home, as no differences were found in the use of Papiamentu ( $p=.590$ ), Dutch ( $p=.642$ ), English ( $p=.210$ ), Spanish ( $p=.708$ ) and other languages ( $p=.606$ ) inside the family.

#### Language use outside the family

The comparison between the different age groups revealed a difference in the use of English ( $F(2,173)=4.967, p=.000 \eta_p^2=.087$ ). A Bonferroni post-hoc revealed that the third (young) generation used English outside the family more often than the first ( $p=.005$ ) and second generations ( $p=.007$ ). No differences were found between the generations for the use of Papiamentu ( $p=.766$ ), Dutch ( $p=.596$ ), Spanish ( $p=.080$ ) and other languages ( $p=.098$ ) outside the family.

#### Language use with strangers

The Kruskal-Wallis test found a difference between the age groups in the use of English ( $H(2)=7.451, p=.024$ ) with strangers. However, the post-hoc test revealed no statistically significant *pairwise* differences between the age groups. That is, the combination of means of the three generations were statistically different, yet the differences could not be interpreted pairwise. No differences between age groups were found in the use of Papiamentu ( $p=.387$ ), Dutch ( $p=.941$ ), Spanish ( $p=.279$ ) and other languages ( $p=.271$ ) with strangers.

### 6.1.2. Education levels

Table 4 presents the average scores for the use of Papiamentu, Dutch, English, Spanish and other languages in different domains by participants of different education levels.

Table 4. *Average scores for language use in different domains by participants belonging to different education levels, including Means and Standard Deviations (0=no use, 5=frequent use).*

		Education levels			
		Low (n=61)		High (n=40)	
Within the family		mean	sd	mean	sd
1	Papiamentu	4,40	1,29	4,51	1,19
2	Dutch	0,46	1,01	0,62	1,24
3	English	0,56	1,17	0,76	1,28
4	Spanish	0,57	1,21	0,45	0,74
5	Other language	0,18	0,61	0,22	0,41
Outside the family		(n=94)		(n=80)	
1	Papiamentu	4,13	1,19	3,65	1,34
2	Dutch	1,27	1,44	2,23	1,42
3	English	0,76	1,27	1,24	1,46
4	Spanish	0,41	0,81	0,60	0,91
5	Other language	0,15	0,63	0,30	0,61

Strangers		(n=110-135)		(n=84-92)	
1	Papiamentu	3,30	2,12	3,30	1,93
2	Dutch	1,48	1,91	2,03	1,89
3	English	1,24	1,72	1,96	1,95
4	Spanish	0,84	1,41	0,95	1,39
5	Other language	0,47	1,28	0,65	1,31

The overall results in Table 4 point out that Papiamentu was the most frequently used language in the different domains by all participants. A statistical analysis of the data provided the following results concerning the use of the respective languages in different domains.

#### Language use within the family

No differences between the groups of different education levels were found for the use of Papiamentu ( $p=.127$ ), Dutch ( $p=.877$ ), English ( $p=.720$ ), Spanish ( $p=.204$ ) and other languages ( $p=.954$ ) within the family.

#### Language use outside the family

The statistical analysis of the results pointed out some differences between the participants of different education levels with respect to their use of Papiamentu and Dutch. Participants of higher education levels used Papiamentu less frequently outside the family than participants of lower education levels ( $F(1,173)=4.343$ ,  $p=.039$   $\eta_p^2=.025$ ). The use of Dutch showed the reverse pattern: higher educated participants used Dutch more often outside the family than lower educated participants ( $F(1,173)=16.111$ ,  $p=.000$   $\eta_p^2=.087$ ). No differences between participants of different education levels were found for the use of English ( $p=.080$ ), Spanish ( $p=.421$ ) and other languages ( $p=.169$ ) outside the family.

#### Language use with strangers

The Kruskal-Wallis test indicated that participants of higher education levels used Dutch ( $H(1)=4.911$ ,  $p=.027$ ), English ( $H(1)=7.744$ ,  $p=.005$ ) and other languages ( $H(1)=5.619$ ,  $p=.018$ ) more often than participants of lower education levels in contact with strangers. No differences were found for the use of Papiamentu ( $p=.524$ ) and Spanish ( $p=.287$ ) with strangers by participants of different education levels.

### **6.1.3. Origin**

Table 5 presents the average scores for the use of Papiamentu, Dutch, English, Spanish and other languages in different domains by participants with a 'local' and 'migrant' background, respectively.

Table 5. Average scores for language use in different domains by participants of different origins, including Means and Standard Deviations (0=no use, 5=frequent use).

		Origin			
		local (n=65)		migrant (n=36)	
		mean	sd	mean	sd
Within the family					
1	Papiamentu	4,79	0,58	3,91	1,72
2	Dutch	0,37	0,87	0,85	1,38
3	English	0,44	0,94	1,01	1,55
4	Spanish	0,31	0,73	0,98	1,43
5	Other language	0,14	0,49	0,32	0,60
Outside the family		(n=115)		(n=59)	
1	Papiamentu	4,04	1,24	3,75	1,27
2	Dutch	1,51	1,50	1,95	1,46
3	English	0,71	1,16	1,46	1,64
4	Spanish	0,38	0,68	0,75	1,19
5	Other language	0,19	0,65	0,25	0,54
Strangers		(n=132-157)		(n=67-77)	
1	Papiamentu	3,40	2,06	3,13	2,04
2	Dutch	1,47	1,80	2,05	2,06
3	English	1,22	1,62	2,09	2,09
4	Spanish	0,78	1,27	1,12	1,64
5	Other language	0,50	1,28	0,68	1,39

The overall results in Table 5 pointed out that Papiamentu was the most frequently used language in the different domains by both groups of participants. A statistical analysis of the data revealed the following results concerning the use of the respective languages in the different domains.

#### Language use within the family

The comparison between ‘local’ and ‘migrant’ participants revealed a difference in the use of Papiamentu and Spanish within the family. Papiamentu was spoken less frequently by ‘migrant’ participants ( $F(1,100)=9.393, p=.003 \eta_p^2=.089$ ), whereas they spoke Spanish more frequently ( $F(1,100)=4.861, p=.030 \eta_p^2=.048$ ) in comparison to ‘local’ participants. No differences between the two groups were found with respect to their use of Dutch ( $p=.268$ ), English ( $p=.327$ ) and other languages ( $p=.549$ ) within the family.

#### Language use outside the family

The statistical analysis of the results indicated that English was spoken more frequently by ‘migrants’ when compared to ‘locals’ outside the family ( $F(1,173)=4.210, p=.042 \eta_p^2=.024$ ). No differences between the two groups were found with respect to the use of Papiamentu ( $p=.326$ ), Dutch ( $p=.583$ ), Spanish ( $p=.232$ ) and other languages ( $p=.551$ ) outside the family.

### Language use with strangers

The Kruskal-Wallis test found that ‘migrants’ used Dutch ( $H(1)=4.068, p=.044$ ) and English ( $H(1)=8.376, p=.004$ ) more frequently than ‘local’ participants in contact with strangers. No differences between the two groups were found in the use of Papiamentu ( $p=.281$ ), Spanish ( $p=.143$ ) and other languages ( $p=.089$ ) with strangers.

## **6.2. Language attitudes**

The second part of the questionnaire was concerned with the investigation of attitudes toward Papiamentu, measured by the importance attributed to the language in carrying out certain activities. The questionnaire contained a list of 20 activities and the results were submitted to a Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Due to low communalities 7 items were excluded from the analysis.<sup>18</sup> The PCA found four factors in the remaining 13 items (as indicated in Appendix B) which were abstracted for further analysis. The first component (C1), which we labelled as Achievements, corresponded to the items ‘...becoming smarter’, ‘...getting a job’, ‘...passing exams’ and ‘...earning plenty of money’. The second component (C2), referred to as Socializing, comprised the items ‘...talking to friends in school’, ‘...talking to people out of school’, ‘...talking to teachers in school’. The third component (C3), Leisure, contained activities such as ‘...making phone calls’, ‘...going shopping’, ‘...singing’ and ‘...playing sport’. Finally, the fourth component (C4), with the label Literacy, consisted of the two items ‘...reading’ and ‘...writing’.

### **6.2.1. Language attitudes among participants of different age groups**

The results in Table 6 illustrate that the participants evaluated Papiamentu as important in carrying out different activities. Papiamentu was considered most important for Component 4: Literacy, that is, reading and writing.

Table 6. *Average scores of the three age groups on clusters of items regarding the importance of Papiamentu in carrying out different activities, including Standard Deviations. The results correspond to a scale from 1 to 4 (1=important, 4=unimportant).*

		Age groups					
		G1 (n=37)		G2 (n=42)		G3 (n=183)	
		mean	sd	mean	sd	mean	sd
1	Achievement	2,06	0,86	2,00	0,82	1,83	0,70
2	Socializing	1,86	0,96	1,75	0,91	1,91	0,74
3	Leisure	1,98	0,82	2,14	0,82	2,27	0,62
4	Literacy	1,56	0,78	1,43	0,61	1,77	0,78

The statistical analysis of the results indicated a significant difference between the age groups concerning Component 4: the importance of Papiamentu for Literacy ( $F(2,214)=3.481, p=.033 \eta_p^2=.033$ ). A Bonferroni post-hoc test revealed, though, that no

<sup>18</sup> Q13: Making friends; Q17: Watching television/video; Q20: Being liked; Q21: Living in Bonaire; Q22: Going to church/chapel; Q25: Bringing up children; Q29: Being accepted in the community.

statistically significant *pairwise* differences were found between the groups. The combination of means of the three groups were statistically different, yet the differences could not be interpreted pairwise. No statistically significant differences were found between the three age groups with respect to the importance of Papiamentu for Component 1: Achievements ( $p=.748$ ), Component 2: Socializing ( $p=.340$ ) and Component 3: Leisure ( $p=.374$ ).

### 6.2.2. Language attitudes among participants of different education levels

In Table 7 we see that the participants of different education levels also expressed rather homogeneous opinions regarding the importance of Papiamentu in carrying out different activities. Again, Papiamentu was considered most important for reading and writing (Component 4: Literacy).

Table 7. *Average scores of the participants of different education levels on clusters of items regarding the importance of Papiamentu in carrying out different activities, including Standard Deviations. The results correspond to a scale from 1 to 4 (1=important, 4=unimportant).*

		Education levels			
		Low (n=148)		High (n=98)	
		mean	sd	mean	sd
1	Achievement	1,78	0,70	2,12	0,78
2	Socializing	1,90	0,79	1,88	0,82
3	Leisure	2,11	0,63	2,41	0,72
4	Literacy	1,65	0,74	1,77	0,81

Higher educated participants found Papiamentu more important for Component 2: Socializing than lower educated participants ( $F(1,214)=8.563$ ,  $p=.004$   $\eta_p^2=.040$ ). No statistically significant differences were found between participants of different education levels with respect to their opinions regarding the importance of Papiamentu for Component 1: Achievements ( $p=.091$ ), Component 3: Leisure ( $p=.557$ ) and Component 4: Literacy ( $p=.298$ ).

### 6.2.3. Language attitudes among participants of different origins

Table 8 illustrates the results with respect to the importance of Papiamentu according to participants of different (parental) birthplaces. Again, Papiamentu was regarded as most important for Component 4.

Table 8. Average scores of the participants of different origins on clusters of items regarding the importance of Papiamentu in carrying out different activities, including Standard Deviations. The results correspond to a scale from 1 to 4 (1=important, 4=unimportant).

		Divided by origin			
		local (n=171)		migrant (n=84)	
		mean	sd	mean	sd
1	Achievement	1,92	0,75	1,84	0,74
2	Socializing	1,81	0,78	2,04	0,81
3	Leisure	2,15	0,70	2,36	0,62
4	Literacy	1,63	0,72	1,83	0,85

Local participants found Papiamentu more important for Component 2: Socializing ( $F(1,214)=4.183, p=.042 \eta_p^2=.020$ ) and Component 3: Leisure ( $F(1,214)=7.491, p=.007 \eta_p^2=.036$ ) than migrant participants. No significant differences were found between the two groups of origin with respect to their attitudes concerning the importance of Papiamentu for Component 1: Achievements ( $p=.122$ ) and Component 4: Literacy ( $p=.731$ ).

### 6.3. Attitudes toward Bonairean and Dutch identity

The questionnaire also contained questions regarding attitudes toward the dual identity of Bonaireans, as citizens of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and inhabitants of Bonaire, a Caribbean, insular community.<sup>19</sup> This part of the questionnaire consisted of a list of 12 items (3 positive and 3 negative statements to investigate both identities respectively). The Principal Component Analysis (PCA) excluded one item due to low communality.<sup>20</sup> The PCA found four components that were abstracted for analysis (see Appendix C). The first component (C1), which we labelled as Bonairean identity, corresponded to the items ‘I am a person who is happy to be Bonairean’, ‘I am a person who considers himself to be Bonairean’, ‘I am a person who identifies with other Bonaireans’. The second component (C2), referred to as Dutch identity, comprised the items ‘I am a person who considers it important to be a Dutch citizen’, ‘I am a person who is happy to be a Dutch citizen’, and ‘I am a person who feels strong ties with the Netherlands’. The third component (C3) was not further analysed due to a low reliability score on Cronbach’s Alpha test.<sup>21</sup> Component 4: Critical attitudes contained the statements ‘I am a person who is critical about Bonaire’ and ‘I am a person who is critical about the Netherlands’. We interpreted these statements as negatively formulated items regarding the two identities,

<sup>19</sup> Some participants mistakenly received the questionnaire intended for participants on Curaçao, containing questions about the Curaçaoan identity. As their interpretation of these questions was unknown, the corresponding answers were classified as ‘missing values’.

<sup>20</sup> This item corresponded to Q9: I am a person who feels held back because I am Bonairean.

<sup>21</sup> The third component comprised the following statements: Q1: I am a person who is bothered to say that I am a Dutch citizen; Q3: I am a person who tends to hide the fact that I am Bonairean; Q7: I am a person who makes excuses for being a Dutch citizen.

with ‘reversed’ scores in comparison to the other statements in this part of the questionnaire.

### 6.3.1. Attitudes toward identity among participants of different age groups

The results in Table 9 indicate that the attitudes toward Bonairean identity were very positive among the three age groups, as the participants tended to agree (strongly) with the statements referring to this identity on an individual and collective level. Attitudes toward their Dutch identity were rather neutral (as a score around 3.0 expresses neutrality) and the participants did not seem to be critical about Bonaire and the Netherlands.

Table 9. *Average scores of the participants of the three age groups on clusters of items regarding their Bonairean identity, Dutch identity and critical attitudes toward Bonaire and the Netherlands, including Standard Deviations. The results correspond to a scale from 1 to 5 (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree).*

		Age groups					
		G1 (n=37)		G2 (n=42)		G3 (n=183)	
		mean	sd	mean	sd	mean	sd
C1	Bonairean identity	1,60	0,77	1,50	0,65	1,72	0,96
C2	Dutch identity	2,80	0,85	2,65	0,79	3,15	0,87
C4	Critical attitudes	4,07	0,83	3,93	1,05	3,18	0,87

A comparative analysis of the three age groups only revealed a statistically significant difference concerning Component 4: Critical attitudes ( $F(2,205)=7.166$ ,  $p=.001$ ,  $\eta_p^2=.069$ ). A Bonferroni post hoc test revealed that the third generation was less critical about Bonaire and the Netherlands than the first ( $p=.000$ ) and second generations ( $p=.000$ ), but the first and second generations were not different from each other.<sup>22</sup> No significant differences were found between the three age groups concerning Component 1: Bonairean identity ( $p=.629$ ) and Component 2: Dutch identity ( $p=.519$ ).

### 6.3.2. Attitudes toward identity among participants of different education levels

The scores in Table 10 reveal that the attitudes toward Bonairean identity were (very) positive among the participants of different education levels. Attitudes toward their Dutch identity were rather neutral and the participants did not seem to be critical about Bonaire and the Netherlands.

<sup>22</sup> It is important to remind the reader of the ‘reverse’ scores of the statements of Component 4, as they contain negatively formulated statements regarding the Dutch and Bonairean identities of the participants. Hence, higher scores correspond to more critical attitudes.

Table 10. Average scores of the participants of different education levels on clusters of items regarding their Bonairean identity, Dutch identity and critical attitudes toward Bonaire and the Netherlands, including Standard Deviations. The results correspond to a scale from 1 to 5 (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree).

		Education levels			
		Low (n=148)		High (n=98)	
		mean	sd	mean	sd
C1	Bonairean identity	1,57	0,88	1,75	0,85
C2	Dutch identity	3,01	0,94	3,01	0,75
C4	Critical attitudes	3,38	1,00	3,58	0,90

No statistically significant differences were found between the results of the participants of different education levels concerning Component 1: Bonairean identity ( $p=.932$ ), Component 2: Dutch identity ( $p=.144$ ) and Component 4: Critical attitudes ( $p=.819$ ).

### 6.3.3. Attitudes toward identity among participants of different origins

The results in Table 11 reveal (very) positive attitudes toward Bonairean identity, especially among the participants of ‘local’ descent. The scores of attitudes toward Dutch identity were neutral and the participants did not seem to be critical about Bonaire and the Netherlands.

Table 11. Average scores of the participants of different origins on clusters of items regarding their Bonairean identity, Dutch identity and critical attitudes toward Bonaire and the Netherlands, including Standard Deviations. The results correspond to a scale from 1 to 5 (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree).

		Origins			
		local (n=171)		migrant (n=84)	
		mean	sd	mean	sd
C1	Bonairean identity	1,47	0,67	2,08	1,14
C2	Dutch identity	2,93	0,87	3,19	0,81
C4	Critical attitudes	3,55	0,99	3,21	0,93

No statistically significant differences were found between the results of the participants with ‘local’ versus ‘migrant’ backgrounds concerning Component 1: Bonairean identity ( $p=.259$ ), Component 2: Dutch identity ( $p=.324$ ) and Component 4: Critical attitudes ( $p=.129$ ).

## 7. Discussion

We repeat the first three research questions from section 4, integrating differences between participants of different age groups, education levels and origins (corresponding to question 4) into the answers based on our findings.

- (1) *How can we characterize the use of Papiamentu, Dutch, English, Spanish and other languages in different domains (inside the family, outside the family, with strangers)?*

The results of our survey revealed that Papiamentu was the most frequently used language for all participants in all domains. Papiamentu was used more often within the family by speakers of ‘local’ descent (as compared to ‘migrants’, Table 5) and outside the family by speakers of lower education levels (as compared to higher education levels, Table 4). The use of Dutch, English and Spanish was much more restricted. The statistical analysis of the results pointed out that Dutch was used more often outside the family by participants of higher education levels (as compared to lower education levels, Table 4) and with strangers by higher educated (Table 4) and ‘migrant’ (Table 5) participants. These patterns can be explained by the traditional role of Dutch in formal domains and the acquisition of Dutch through the education system. English was more often used by the younger generation (Table 3) and by ‘migrants’ outside the family (Table 5) as well as by higher educated participants (Table 4) and migrants (Table 5) with strangers. These results may follow from the increasing exposure to English by the media (especially among the younger generations), and its global role as a *lingua franca* for communication with unknown individuals. Spanish was used more frequently by ‘migrants’ (as compared to ‘locals’) within the family (Table 5), which may point at language use at home by newly arrived immigrants.

- (2) *What are the attitudes toward Papiamentu, measured by the importance of the language in carrying out certain activities?*

All participants found Papiamentu most important for Literacy (C4), that is, for reading and writing. Higher educated participants found Papiamentu more important for Socializing (C2) as compared to lower educated participants (Table 7). ‘Local’ participants evaluated Papiamentu as more important for Socializing (C2) and Leisure activities (C3) (Table 8). The scores for the importance of Papiamentu in carrying out other activities (C1: Achievements and C4: Literacy) were very homogeneous.

- (3) *What are the attitudes toward the dual identity of the Bonairean population, as members of a Caribbean insular community and as Dutch citizens?*

The results of the survey indicated that attitudes toward the Bonairean identity of the participants were (very) positive and attitudes toward their Dutch identity were neutral. The younger generation was less critical about both the Netherlands and Bonaire as compared to older generations (Table 9). There were no differences in this respect between participants of different education levels (Table 10) or different origins (Table 11).

The hypotheses presented in section 4 are repeated below to discuss the findings in more detail.

- (1) *There is increasing use of Dutch and decreasing use of Papiamentu (especially in formal domains), because the use of Dutch is promoted by the current language policy.*

This hypothesis was not corroborated, because Papiamentu was the most frequently used language across all participants in the different domains. The use of other languages, including Dutch, is rather restricted.

- (2) *There are negative tendencies in the attitudes toward Papiamentu. The language may be regarded as unimportant in carrying out activities that are related to formal domains and instrumental orientation (job market, education system).*

This hypothesis was not corroborated by the results of the survey, as all participants found Papiamentu most important for Literacy (C4), that is, for reading and writing and the scores for Achievements (C1) were also high across the different categories of participants.

- (3) *There are negative tendencies in the attitudes toward Dutch citizenship and the European Netherlands, resulting from the political reforms and their consequences for the community.*

This hypothesis was not corroborated as the attitudes toward Dutch and the European Netherlands were neutral across the different groups of participants. The younger generation was less critical about both the Netherlands and Bonaire.

- (4) *Scores that indicate decreasing use of Papiamentu and negative attitudes toward Papiamentu, Dutch identity and Dutch citizenship are significantly higher among younger participants compared to those of older participants.*

This hypothesis was not corroborated. The results of the survey indicated that the younger generation was less critical toward Bonaire and the Netherlands, but there were no other statistically significant differences between the age groups with respect to their use of Papiamentu, nor their attitudes toward Papiamentu and their Dutch identity.

## **8. Conclusion**

In this article, we presented the results of a survey that was conducted among 262 participants on Bonaire in 2014 to study the language situation on the island. A quantitative study about language use and attitudes toward language and identity is urgent from a political and societal perspective, since Bonaire adopted a new political status as an exceptional municipality of the European Netherlands in October 2010. As pointed out in Bak-Piard (2010, 2016) the political reform has had a major impact on the small island community, causing great concern about the use and vitality of Papiamentu.

The results of our survey revealed rather homogenous patterns across the different categories of participants. Papiamentu was the most frequently used language in different domains across all categories of participants. The use of other languages was rather restricted. Attitudes toward Papiamentu were (very) positive as well. The participants from different age groups, education levels and origins considered the language to be

most important for reading and writing (C4). They also shared (very) positive attitudes toward Bonairean identity.

Interestingly, our hypotheses based on Bak-Piard (2010, 2016) were not corroborated. The results did not reveal an increasing use of Dutch combined with a decreasing use of Papiamentu. Papiamentu was regarded as important for instrumental purposes and formal domains. Attitudes toward Dutch identity were neutral, and the participants were not very critical about the European Netherlands. There were no significant differences between participants of different age groups.

The impact of the political reforms described by Bak-Piard (2010, 2016) clearly requires more in-depth and longitudinal research. Due to the lack of previous quantitative studies about the language situation on Bonaire, it is impossible to assess whether language use and attitudes have changed in comparison to the situation prior to 2010. The survey was conducted only 3,5 years after the political reforms, a short period of time to witness the impact on complex phenomena such as language use and attitudes. Notice, however, that our findings provide an important baseline study for future research regarding sociolinguistic developments in a small island community under postcolonial rule.

Obviously, the results of our study are not only relevant from a scholarly perspective, but also from a political and societal point of view. As we pointed out above, fierce debates concerning the language policy in the education system have been raging over the ABC-islands for decades and have been fueled by the new political status of Bonaire. Our findings are useful to acknowledge the importance of Papiamentu, contributing to the development of a sustainable language policy, also for an education system that will serve Bonairean students to achieve their full potential.

## Appendix A Questionnaire

### Kuestionario

E kuestionario aki ta relashoná ku e programa di Master of Education di University of Curaçao. E studiantenan tin ku prepará un ensayo ku ta forma parti di un curso riba kontakto entre diferente idioma ku e studiante ta sigui serka señora dr. Ellen-Petra Kester di Universidat di Utrecht.

E kuestionario ta trata di bo opinion riba importansia i uso di papiamentu i e identidat dòbel komo boneriano i siudadano hulandes.

Nos ta pidi pa kontestá tur pregunta sinseramente. No tin kontesta korekto òf inkorekto; ta trata únikamente di bo opinion personal.

E kuestionario ta anónimo i lo trata tur informashon konfidensialmente. Si tin interes pa e temanan di e kuestionario òf e resultadonan di e investigashon por tuma kontakto ku señora Kester atraves di [ellenpetrakester@gmail.com](mailto:ellenpetrakester@gmail.com). Masha danki pa bo kooperashon!

### Parti 1

Aki bou ta presentá ponensia tokante identidat komo boneriano i siudadano hulandes. Por favor, indiká si bo ta di akuerdo òf na desakuerdo ku e ponensianan, markando bo kontesta ku un sírkulo.

KA	= Kompletamente di akuerdo	(marka KA)
DA	= Di akuerdo	(marka DA)
NE	= Neutral, ni di akuerdo, ni na desakuerdo	(marka NE)
ND	= Na desakuerdo	(marka ND)
KD	= Kompletamente na desakuerdo	(marka KD)

Mi ta un persona ku...

- |   |    |    |    |    |
|---|----|----|----|----|
| 1. tin difikultat pa bisa ku mi ta un siudadano hulandes.   | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 2. ta sinti lasonan fuerte ku Hulanda.                      | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 3. tin e tendencia di skonde e echo ku mi ta boneriano.     | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 4. ta kontentu di ta boneriano.                             | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 5. ta identifiká su mes ku otro boneriano.                  | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 6. ta konsiderá e echo di ta siudadano hulandes importante. | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 7. tin bèrgwensa pa e echo ku mi ta un siudadano hulandes.  | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 8. ta konsiderá mi mes un boneriano.                        | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 9. ta sinti ku mi ta wòrdu tene abou pasó mi ta boneriano.  | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 10. ta krítiko ku kosnan relashoná ku Hulanda.              | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 11. ta kontentu di ta un siudadano hulandes.                | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |
| 12. ta krítiko ku kosnan relashoná ku Boneiru.              | KA | DA | NE | ND |
|   | KD |    |    |    |

**Parti 2**

Kon importante òf no importante papiamentu ta pa e siguiente situashonnan? Por favor, marka bo kontesta ku un krus den e hòki.

	PA HENDE:	Importante	Basta importante	Poko importante	No importante
1	sera amistad				
2	gana hopi plaka				
3	lesa				
4	skibi				
5	wak televishon/video				
6	haña trabou				
7	bira mas sabí				
8	gusta bo				
9	biba na Boneiru				
10	bai misa				
11	kanta				
12	hasi deporte				
13	eduká mucha				
14	hasi kompra				
15	hasi yamada telefóniko				

16	pasa èksamen				
17	keda aseptá den komunidat				
18	papia ku amigu na skol				
19	papia ku dosente na skol				
20	papia ku otro pafó di skol				

### Parti 3

Kua idioma bo ta usa den e siguiente situashonnan?

PP = Prinsipalmente papiamentu

PH = Prinsipalmente hulandes

PI = Prinsipalmente ingles

PS = Prinsipalmente spañó

VI = Varios idioma meskos

- |    |                            |    |    |    |    |    |
|----|----------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1. | Na bo kas ku bo famia      | PP | PH | PI | PS | VI |
| 2. | Na trabou ku bo koleganan  | PP | PH | PI | PS | VI |
| 3. | Na trabou ku bo hefe       | PP | PH | PI | PS | VI |
| 4. | Na skol ku bo kompañeronan | PP | PH | PI | PS | VI |
| 5. | Na skol ku bo dosentenan   | PP | PH | PI | PS | VI |
| 6. | Ku bo amigunan             | PP | PH | PI | PS | VI |

7. Ku hende deskonosí

PP

PH

PI

PS

VI

Kua idioma bo ta usa diariamente ora bo ta papia ku ...

(Pone un sifra entre 1 i 5 den e hòki ku bo skohe. 5 ke men hopi. 1 ke men tiki. Ta posibel pa usa e mes sifra mas ku un biaha.)

	papiamentu	hulandes	ingles	spañó	otro idioma
bo mama					
bo tata					
bo ruman muhénan					
bo ruman hòmbènan					
bo yunan					
bo amigunan					
bo kompañeronan di klas					
bo dosente					
bo koleganan					
bo hefe di trabou					
hende deskonosí					



## Appendix B Principal Component Analysis (importance of Papiamentu)

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
P2: become smarter	0,785	0,183	0,109	0,191
P2: get a job	0,784	0,154	0,105	0,149
P2: pass exams	0,752	0,052	0,102	0,215
P2: earn plenty of money	0,712	0,087	0,148	0,007
P2: talk to friends in school	0,106	0,857	0,237	0,068
P2: talk to people out of school	0,069	0,852	0,209	0,063
P2: talk to teachers in school	0,333	0,696	0,098	0,199
P2: make phone calls	-0,018	0,193	0,742	0,117
P2: go shopping	0,320	0,086	0,725	0,010
P2: sing	0,110	0,201	0,683	0,154
P2: play sports	0,509	0,133	0,522	0,029
P2: read	0,179	0,109	0,121	0,904
P2: write	0,209	0,142	0,130	0,889
variance explained	22%	16%	15%	13%
reliability - Cronbachs Alpha	.810	.804	.709	.870

## Appendix C Principal Component Analysis (attitudes toward identity)

I am a person who ...	Component			
	1	2	3	4
4. is happy to be Aruban / Bonairean / Curaçaoan.	0,850	0,002	0,138	-0,025
8. considers himself to be Aruban / Bonairean / Curaçaoan.	0,844	0,007	0,124	-0,082
5. identifies with other Arubans/ Bonaireans/ Curaçaoans.	0,712	0,167	-0,198	-0,061
6. considers it important to be a Dutch citizen.	0,129	0,759	0,119	-0,031
11. is happy to be a Dutch citizen.	0,043	0,744	0,239	0,046
2. feels strong ties with the Netherlands	-0,001	0,665	-0,064	-0,109
1. is bothered to say I am a Dutch citizen (r)	-0,103	0,239	0,694	0,072
3. tends to hide the fact I'm Aruban /Bonairean /Curaçaoan (r)	0,240	-0,229	0,672	-0,076
7. makes excuses for being a Dutch citizen (r)	-0,011	0,378	0,661	0,142
12. is critical about Aruba /Bonaire /Curaçao (r)	-0,090	-0,017	-0,033	0,830
10. is critical about the Netherlands (r)	-0,043	-0,070	0,125	0,816
variance explained	19%	17%	14%	13%
reliability - Cronbachs Alpha	.736	.624	<b>.484</b>	.563

## References

- Ajzen, Icek. 1988. *Attitudes, personality and behaviour*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Baker, Colin. 1992. *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bak-Piard, Maxy. 2010. Will Papiamentu survive on Bonaire? In Nicholas Faraclas, Ronald Severing, Christa Weijer & Elisabeth Echteld (eds.), *Crossing shifting boundaries: language and changing political status in Aruba, Bonaire and Curaçao*, 41–47. Curaçao: FPI/UNA.
- Bak-Piard, Maxy. 2016. Has Papiamentu survived on Bonaire? In Nicholas Faraclas, Ronald Severing, Christa Weijer, Elisabeth Echteld, Wim Rutgers & Robert Dupey (eds.), *Embracing multiple identities: opting out of neocolonial monolingualism, monoculturalism and mono-identification in the Dutch Caribbean*, 99–111. Curaçao/Puerto Rico: UoC/UPR.
- Bestuursafpraak voor het Papiaments op Bonaire. <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/rapporten/2021/03/23/bestuursafpraak-voor-het-papiaments-op-bonaire> (30 July 2021).
- Carroll, Kevin S. 2015. Language maintenance in the Caribbean: Examining perceptions of threat in Aruba and Puerto Rico. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 39(2), 115–135.
- Central Bureau of Statistics, Caribisch Nederland. <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/83774NED/table?ts=1627916013676> (30 July 2021).
- Dijkhoff, Martha & Joyce Pereira. 2010. Language and education in Aruba, Bonaire and Curaçao. In Bettine Migge, Isabelle Léglise & Angela Bartens (eds.), *Creoles in education: An appraisal of current programs and projects*, 237–272. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Edwards, John. 2009. *Language and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Faraclas, Nicholas, Ellen-Petra Kester & Eric Mijts. 2019. *Community Based Research in Language Policy and Planning. The Language of Instruction in Education in Sint Eustatius*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Ferguson, Charles. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15. 325–340.
- Gardner, Robert C. & Wallace E. Lambert. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Garrett, Hélène. 2008. Language use, language attitudes and identity among Papiamentu speakers. In Nicholas Faraclas, Ronald Severing & Christa Weijer (eds.), *Linguistic Studies on Papiamentu*, 27–45. Curaçao: Fundashon pa Planifikashon di Idioma.
- Holm, John. 2000. *An introduction to pidgins and creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, Bart. 2012. *Origins of a creole: the history of Papiamentu and its African ties*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kester, Ellen-Petra. 2011. Language use, language attitudes and identity among Curaçaoan high school students. In Nicholas Faraclas, Ronald Severing, Christa Weijer & Elisabeth Echteld (eds.), *Iguana's newfound voices: continuity, divergence and convergence in language, culture and society on the ABC-islands*, 25–38. Curaçao/Puerto Rico: FPI; UoC/UPR.

- Kester, Ellen-Petra. 2020. Language use, language attitudes and identity in Curaçao. In Talia Bugel & Cecilia Montes-Alcalá (eds.), *New Approaches to Language attitudes in the Hispanic and Lusophone world*, 155–181. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kester, Ellen-Petra & Ariadna Timp. 2018. Language attitudes among students in Bonaire. In Nicholas Faraclas, Ronald Severing, Christa Weijer, Elisabeth Echteld, Wim Rutgers & Sally Delgado (eds.), *Dissolving Disciplines: Tidal shifts in the study of the languages, literatures and cultures in the Dutch Caribbean and beyond*, 39–58. Curaçao/Puerto Rico: University of Curaçao/ University of Puerto Rico at Río Piedras.
- Mijts, Eric, Ellen-Petra Kester & Nicholas Faraclas. 2020. Challenges for inclusive education through home languages in the Caribbean part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands: Challenging colonial and neo-colonial beliefs about the role of languages in education. In Janice E. Jules & Korah L. Belgrave (eds.), *Transformative pedagogical perspectives on home language use in classrooms*, 172–186. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Rijksoverheid. 2021. Welke erkende talen heeft Nederland? <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/erkende-talen/vraag-en-antwoord/erkende-talen-nederland> (20 November 2021).
- Severing, Ronald & Christa Weijer. 2008. The Fundashon pa Planifikashon di Idioma: language planning and language policy in Curaçao. In Nicholas Faraclas, Ronald Severing & Christa Weijer (eds.), *Linguistic Studies on Papiamentu*, 247–261. Curaçao: Fundashon pa Planifikashon di Idioma.
- Taalregelingen voor de BES-eilanden. 2012. <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/brochures/2012/04/16/taalregelingen-voor-de-bes-eilanden-in-de-nederlandse-wet-en-regelgeving> (30 July 2021).
- Tajfel, Henry & John C. Turner. 1986. The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In Stephen Worchel & William G. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations*, 7–24. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- UNESCO. 2011. *UNESCO's language vitality and endangerment methodological guideline*. [http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/unescolanguage\\_vitaly\\_and\\_endangerment\\_methodological\\_guideline.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/unescolanguage_vitaly_and_endangerment_methodological_guideline.pdf) (30 July 2021).
- Winford, Donald. 1985. The concept of “diglossia” in Caribbean creole situations. *Language in Society* 14. 345–356.
- Winford, Donald. 1994. Sociolinguistic Approaches to Language Use in the Anglophone Caribbean. In Marcyliena Morgan (ed.), *Language and the Social Construction of Identity in Creole Situations*, 43–62. Los Angeles: Center for Afro-American Studies, University of California.